

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 5-6 are canceled. Claims 1-4, and 7-69 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 2-4, 7-14, 18, 22, 25-26, 29, 32-39, 45-47, 49, 51-55, 60-61, 64, and 67-68 have been amended solely to maintain proper antecedence and to have claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16, 21-27, 36-56, and 67-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,904) in view of Zenith (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,771). Claims 5-6 are canceled. Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 1, for example, defines a client device that includes:

a display unit operable to display a user list identifying a plurality of users of said client device, and when a given one of the plurality of users is selected and verified, to display content based on the content data, to display a plurality of icon buttons such that a given one of the plurality of icon buttons represents a particular one of the plurality of icons, and to display a plurality of visual clues whereby a given one of the plurality of visual clues is associated with a specific one of a plurality of members of a buddy list associated with that user and indicates an on-line status of a client device associated with that member, the plurality of visual clues being smaller than a depiction of the plurality of members of the buddy list, said display unit being operable to display the depiction of the plurality of members of the buddy list in place of the plurality of visual clues[.] (Emphasis added.)

Neither the cited sections of Cooper nor the cited sections of Zenith disclose or suggest displaying a user list identifying a plurality of users of a client device. Further

none of the cited sections of the references discloses or suggests that when a given one of the plurality of users is selected and verified, content and visuals clues are displayed, and none of the sections of the references discloses or suggests displaying a plurality of visual clues whereby a given one of the plurality of visual clues is associated with a specific one of a plurality of members of buddy list associated with that user. For example, though the Cooper patent shows a menu item "Buddy" in Fig. 5 and a buddy list in Fig. 11, the cited sections of Cooper do not disclose or suggest the plurality of visual clues as defined in claim 1.

It follows that claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 2-4, 7-16, and 21-23 depend from claim 1 and are distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 24 and independent claim 50 each recite limitations similar to those of claim 1 as set out above in the Remarks, and for at least the same reasons, are patentably distinct and unobvious over Cooper and Zenith.

Claims 25-27 and 36-49 depend from claim 24, and claim 51-56 and 67-69 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of these claims is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as its parent claim.

The Examiner also rejected claims 17-20, 28-35, and 57-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith and further in view of DeWeese (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0262542). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 1, claims 28-35 depend from claim 24, and claims 57-66 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of claims 17-20, 28-35, and 57-66 is

distinguishable over Cooper and Zenith for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends. The DeWeese publication does not remedy these deficiencies.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant